1	KEKER & VAN NEST LLP ROBERT A. VAN NEST - # 84065	
2	rvannest@kvn.com CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - # 184325	
3	canderson@kvn.com DANIEL PURCELL - # 191424	
4	dpurcell@kvn.com	
5	633 Battery Street San Francisco, CA 94111-1809	
6	Telephone: (415) 391-5400 Facsimile: (415) 397-7188	
7	KING & SPALDING LLP	
8	BRUCE W. BABER (pro hac vice) bbaber@kslaw.com	
9	1185 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036	
10	Telephone: (212) 556-2100 Facsimile: (212) 556-2222	
11	Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.	
12		DISTRICT COURT
13		CT OF CALIFORNIA
14	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
15		
16	ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,	Case No. 3:10-cv-03561 WHA
17	Plaintiffs,	DECLARATION OF RENNY HWANG IN SUPPORT OF ORACLE'S
18	v.	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL RE ORACLE'S OPPOSITION TO
19	GOOGLE INC.,	GOOGLE'S RULE 50 MOTION
20	Defendant.	
21		Dept. Courtroom 8, 19 th Fl. Judge: Hon. William Alsup
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

I, RENNY HWANG, declare as follows:

- 1. I am an attorney employed by Google Inc. ("Google"), where I have served as senior litigation counsel for the last six years. My job responsibilities include, but are not limited to, supervising our outside counsel in connection with litigation matters (such as this one), as well as familiarizing myself with the areas of Google's businesses and documentation concerning those businesses as they relate to litigation matters under my supervision. I submit this declaration in support of Oracle's Administrative Motion to File Under Seal Portions of Oracle's Opposition to Google's Rule 50(A) Motion and Exhibit A to the Silverman Declaration ("Exhibit A"). *See* ECF No. 1958. I have knowledge of the facts set forth herein, and if called upon as a witness, I could testify to them competently under oath.
- 2. I have reviewed Oracle's Opposition to Google's Rule 50(a) Motion and Exhibit A. Pages 2, 3, 5-11, 6, 7, 13, 22-24, 25, 33-38, 41-42, and 44, 46, 47 of Exhibit A contain highly sensitive confidential third party information, as well as Google's non-public financial data. These slides contain information related to confidential third-party agreements. This information is subject to stringent confidentiality requirements contained within the relevant agreement. Indeed, Google places strict limits on who has access to the terms of these agreements to ensure confidentiality is retained. Also, Google does not disclose this information to the public. Public disclosure of this information could severely and adversely impact Google's ability to negotiate, among other things, similar terms with other third parties in connection with similar agreements now or in the future. In addition, Google does not publicly allocate revenue or profits to Android separate and apart from Google's general business. Accordingly, Google considers the non-public financial data identified in Exhibit A to be highly sensitive, and public disclosure of that information could have significant negative effects on Google's business.
- 3. Page 10 lines 10-12 of Google's Rule 50(a) Motion, summarizes information from pages 6-7 of Exhibit A. These lines contain highly sensitive non-public Android financial information and confidential third-party information, and should be sealed for the reasons stated in paragraph 2.

- 4. Exhibit A was not offered or admitted into evidence during the trial and is not publicly available. Exhibit A is not part of the trial record: it was not shown in Court, used by either party, or considered by the jury as part of its fair use deliberations. Nor is Exhibit A relied on by Oracle as part of its opposition to Google's Rule 50 Motion. Oracle only cited Exhibit A as evidence it *intended* to introduce if the trial proceeded to a second phase. On May 26, 2016, the jury returned a verdict finding in favor of Google and thus the case will not proceed to a second phase. Accordingly, Exhibit A will not become part of the trial record.
- 5. Pages 2, 3, 5-11, 6, 7, 13, 22-24, 25, 33-38, 41-42, 44, 46, 47 of Exhibit A containing information related to Google's financials and sensitive third-party agreements and page 10, lines 10-12 of Oracle's Opposition to Google's Rule 50(a) motion should therefore be sealed.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed this 27th day of May, 2016 at Los Altos, California.

By:

RENNY HWANG